

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
January 18, 2007**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Dennis Cope, Robert Hall, Lee Madrid, David Scott Meade, and Sally Promer-Nichols

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steve Fischer, Senior Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:05 PM. Design Review Board members Mery Velastegui and David Wobker were excused.

**MINUTES**

**December 7, 2006:**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COPE AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 7, 2006 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED (3-0-1, WITH MR. MADRID ABSTAINING.**

(Mr. Hall arrived at 7:07 PM.)

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**PRE070001, Redmond 74**

**Description:** Planned development of 33 buildings comprising 108 dwelling units. Approximately 235,000 gross square feet. Buildings are comprised of a mixture of townhomes, duplexes and row houses.

**Location:** 10638 155<sup>th</sup> PI NE

**Applicant:** Elizabeta Stacishin

**Staff Contact:** Steve Fischer / 425.556.2432

Steve Fischer presented the staff report, giving the history of this site. He explained that the City always asks for exceptional architecture in a PRD. He described this pre-application as the multi-family component of the Redmond 74 Planned Residential Development, commenting that this proposal is much better in terms of scale and mass than previous proposals.

Ginger Garff, 425 Pontius Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98040, with Weber + Thompson, explained that they have taken the buildings with the largest mass, the 5-unit townhouses, and set them back 25 feet from the property line along Redmond-Woodinville Road. They are trying to put the pedestrians first and take the cars away. Then there are duplexes, then 5-unit row houses, and then more duplexes. The main entrances face streets, the garages face alleys, and there is vegetation along the back of the alleys. The style is generally Northwest Craftsman. They have not finalized the colors, but they will probably use muted greens and browns to reflect the Sammamish Trail.

Elizabeta Stacishin, 1017 Minor Ave. #903, Seattle, WA 98104, noted the façade that would be facing Redmond-Woodinville Road.

**COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:**

**Mr. Hall:**

- Suggested having more open space, providing some guest parking, and making the turns around the units easier.

Mr. Cope:

- Wondered why a landscape architect was not present at the meeting, and learned from the applicant that he had a prior commitment. He thought it worked to the applicant's disadvantage not to have a landscape professional present.
- Remembered that a previous proposal for development had a feature that engaged the wetland. The wetland is an amenity, and some gesture toward that in the design would be good for everyone.
- Wanted to know the width of the alleys. (The applicant answered that they would have 25 feet of backup space and narrow to a 20-foot fire lane.)
- Wanted to know if it is often that they replicate projects. (The applicant responded that it is.) Mr. Cope said he was stunned by that.
- Commented that the five-unit townhome buildings along Redmond-Woodinville Road are by far the weakest. He explained that it is the DRB's obligation to stick with requiring exceptional architecture. Even as a stand-alone building, the design does not do that. The cookie cutter buildings along there do not engage the site. That is the face that meets the City of Redmond and is by far the least successful. There are eight of those that drive that home.
- Thought that the unit on page 10 had some interesting things going on, especially at the ends. He thought it hard to tell the middle three units apart. He did not think it would take too much detailing to personalize the buildings to make them a little richer.
- Asked what bathroom would be used by the fourth bedroom on page 17, third floor plan. (The applicant replied that it would be the option of the owner whether or not to use that room as a bedroom. If so, the occupant of the bedroom could use any bathroom in the house.)
- Liked the alleys.
- Liked the idea of having different sized buildings—thought that quite nice.
- Thought the plan had a long way to go to reach the level of exceptional architecture in the site planning, landscaping and certainly along Redmond-Woodinville Road.
- Was curious that the approach taken was to cobble together pieces of projects that have been done other places.
- Commented that the success of this development would come with the work of the landscape architect.

Mr. Hall:

- Recommended investigating to see if they could create a green street and eliminate those three streets. Scatter the guest parking around a bit more, locating it only in the center of the site.
- Questioned if the site plan, circulation for vehicles, and the creation of attractive open spaces were really working. Suggested taking another run at it.
- Thought the bigger buildings could use some help. He thought they did belong along Redmond-Woodinville Road in terms of scale.
- Thought the step down was heading in the right direction.
- Questioned if they needed both streets and alleys. Suggested they find a solution to that.
- Suggested that the applicant decide what this place wants to be. The project needs to have something of its own to create its own identity.
- Suggested doing a bubble diagram on the site and creating a vital place in the center.

Mr. Meade:

- Echoed previous comments.
- Said his biggest concern is the front of the buildings along Redmond-Woodinville Road. Did not think the buildings are functioning. Did not think the variety along that street was satisfactory. Suggested that they go back to the drawing board and provide at least one other option, if not two, along that street, especially since that is the public face.
- Pointed out that they have an opportunity with the row houses. The one with brick was more successful. On the wooden one, the large newel posts at the base of the stairs on page 10 are really unsuccessful—oversized and do not work because they are out of scale. Suggested that they be broken down in scale.
- Suggested fine tuning the buildings that they had fixed in the field.

Mr. Madrid:

- Agreed with the previous comments.
- Noticed on the townhomes there were Juliet balconies. Wanted to know if they could put larger balconies there. (The applicant agreed that the larger units could accommodate larger balconies.)
- Agreed with Mr. Hall that the open space is not adequate. The playground is very small. Suggested that they manipulate the site plan to add areas that bring people together. There is no place for a social event. Suggested waiting to see what the landscape architect designed.
- Did not notice trash enclosures so assumed the units had their own. If they are to be individually provided, he did not see a place to store them.
- Commented that there are creative ways to screen these trash receptacles. Thought it nice to see projects that take that into consideration.
- Commented about the architecture on the individual buildings, saying that he could bisect every unit with a pen. There was no richness and no creativity. He would like to see something more interesting. He suggested playing with mass or arrangement or some other component to make it more interesting. He recommended staying within the massing of the total structures.
- Agreed that they should make something of that wonderful wetland. Should create something that will draw interest to it so people can view and enjoy it. He pointed out that none of the units face the wetland.
- Liked the architectural style overall, but would like to see it be more creative.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Echoed the other comments.
- Appreciated the alleys. Liked the feel of the alleys at Sand Point.
- Thought it was a good point about guest parking. There are a lot of units with no space for guests anywhere near them. Thought it was asking a lot for people to have to navigate in the Planned Residential Development.
- Thought a gesture to the wetlands was important.
- Was nervous when there was a playground surrounded by roads, yet there is this nice open space along 156<sup>th</sup>, which would be a much more protected and safe environment for a playground. There could be more surveillance. She recommended rethinking the playground piece.
- Liked the buildings that they use for the most part, but would like to see more individuality. The layout seemed so rigid.

Ms. Stacishin commented that everyone is aware and afraid of going through the entitlement process at the City of Redmond because the process is very difficult and time consuming. Their buildings are designed and detailed up to 90%, which saves them time. She added that she thought it was a difficult adjacency along Redmond-Woodinville Road.

Regarding the DRB comment that there should be some gesture towards the wetlands, Mr. Fischer explained to the applicant that this is not a requirement of the PRD. However, if they were to consider an overlook, he would encourage them to look at the overlooks at the cottage project at 132<sup>nd</sup> and 112<sup>th</sup> on the east side. There are two extremely successful overlooks along the ravine that will be enjoyed by the residents out there. He noted that there is no stormwater detention provided because this development benefits from the development there before it—just needs to connect to the pipes.

**SUSTAINABILITY**

Although sustainability was not on the agenda, Mr. Cope and Ms. Promer-Nichols requested that the Design Review Board sponsor a sustainability policy resolution for submittal to the City Council for approval.

Mr. Hall expressed concern about the lack of affordability this would cause if sustainability policies became a requirement.

A discussion followed with consensus to sponsor a resolution. There was preference for the Issaquah resolution model.

Mr. Cope and Mr. Meade agreed to draft the resolution.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:45 PM. MOTION CARRIED (5-0).**

---

**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

---

**RECORDING SECRETARY**